



**PATENT
Mail Stop Amendment**

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In Re		Group Art	
Appln. of:	Amin Kassis et al.	Unit:	1651
Serial No.:	09/839,779	Conf. No.:	2010
Filed:	20 April 2001	Examiner:	Jon P. Weber, Ph.D.
For:	Methods for Tumor Diagnosis and Therapy	Atty Docket No.:	U0381-00001

APPLICANTS' INTERVIEW SUMMARY

This Summary is filed to comply with the Applicants' responsibility, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.133(b) to provide a complete written statement of the reasoning presented during the telephone interview conducted on 24 June 2004 with respect to the patent application referenced above.

A copy of a draft Amendment forwarded to the Examiner prior to the interview and discussed during the interview is enclosed herewith.

During the telephone interview, the prior arguments regarding the degree of drug insolubilization achieved using the claimed methods and in references cited by the Examiner. No agreement was reached on this issue.

The Applicants' representative suggested that none of the references cited by the Examiner disclose extracellular prodrug cleavage using an enzyme naturally produced by the tumor cells in an animal (i.e., as recited in claim 24 of the enclosed draft Amendment), and that claims that include such a recitation should be considered allowable, even in view of the references cited by the Examiner. The Applicants' representative indicated that enzymes naturally produced by a tumor cell could be enzymes secreted by tumor cells into the tumor extracellular matrix, enzymes bound to or within that matrix, or cell surface enzymes of tumor cells. The Applicants' representative believes that the Examiner indicated that, although further

consideration of the issue might be needed, it appeared that claims that recite that the enzyme is naturally produced by tumor cells may be allowable.

The particular chemical formulas recited in claims 51 and 55 of the enclosed draft Amendment were discussed, and differences between those formulas and formulas disclosed in references cited by the Examiner were highlighted by the Applicants' representative. Although the Examiner indicated that further consideration of the issue might be needed, the Applicants' representative believes that the Examiner indicated that claims that recited those formulas appeared to be allowable if formally submitted.

Finally, the Examiner indicated that he was assuming new responsibilities within the Office, and that it was possible that a new examiner would be assigned to this application. The Applicants' representative thanked the Examiner for his time and consideration and indicated that a further response would be filed after consultation with the client.

Respectfully submitted,

Amin I. Kassis et al.

15 July 2004
(Date)

By: 

Gary D. Colby, Ph.D., J.D.

Registration No. 40,961

Customer No. 08933

DUANE MORRIS LLP

One Liberty Place

Philadelphia, PA 19103-7396

Telephone: 215-979-1000

Direct Dial: 215-979-1849

Facsimile: 215-979-1020

E-Mail: GDColby@DuaneMorris.com

Enclosures: Draft Amendment